

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICANT: KEIRSGIETER, Petrus Jacobus

SERIAL NO.: 10/597,670

ART UNIT: 3732 (conf. 4738)

FILED: April 9, 2007

EXAMINER: Ballinger, M. R.

TITLE: DENTAL TREATMENT APPARATUS

Amendment B: REMARKS

Upon entry of the present amendments, Claims 13-23 remain pending. Previous Claims 1 - 12 were canceled in a previous amendment. Reconsideration of the rejections, in light of the forgoing amendments and present remarks, is respectfully requested. The present amendments have been entered for the purpose of placing the application into a proper condition for allowance. The present amendment is being submitted under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 as an after-final amendment to conform the drawings, specification, and claims as required in the final Office action of 9 October 2009.

In the Office Action, it was indicated that the drawings required a reference numeral for the cable element. The drawings have been amended to include reference numeral "20", and a corresponding specification amendment has been entered in Paragraph [0014] of the specification.

In the Office Action, it was indicated that the specification contained new matter under 35 U.S.C. §132(a) for stating "impossible to incorporate" in Paragraph [0037] of the Marked Up copy/[0019] of the Substitute Specification. The specification has been amended to remove the new matter. "Impossible" has been amended back to "possible", as in the original disclosure. The error was a typographical error. The Applicant's claim amendments did not change the purpose or effect of the invention as described. Another typographical error for "of" was also corrected.

In the Office Action, it was indicated that Claims 13-23 were allowable if rewritten or

amended to overcome the rejections of the Office Action.

Claim 13 has been amended to overcome the rejections. The antecedent basis for "lines" has been clarified as "lines of the treatment unit". The "coupled to said first part" is clarified as "being suitable for coupling to said first part". The exact coupling relationship is described in further detail in Claim 13, as indicated in the Office Action of October 9, 2009. The claim language no clarifies that claimed coupled relationship is the subject matter of Claim 13.

Claim 22 has been amended to overcome the rejection. The antecedent basis for "thickness" has been clarified as thickness of the first part.

Claims 14-23 have been amended to overcome the rejections. The transitional phrases have been added in each claim.

Based upon the foregoing analysis, Applicant contends that the claims are now in a proper condition for allowance. Additionally, those claims which are dependent upon these independent claims should also be in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the drawing objections and claim rejections, in light of the foregoing amendments and present remarks, is respectfully requested.

A Notice of Allowance and Issue Fee Due for the claim at an early date is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

December 30, 2009
Date
Customer No. 24106

/John S. Egbert/
John S. Egbert: Reg. No. 30,627
Attorney for Applicant
Egbert Law Offices PLLC
412 Main Street, 7th Floor
Houston, Texas 77002
(713)224-8080
(713)223-4873 fax